

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The drawings have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's Requirement by removing shading and/or showing by a borderline the limit of the original shading.

Replacement sheets 1/13 through 13/13 are enclosed as an appendix hereof.

REMARKS

This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action of March 6, 2006 in which claims 1-11 were rejected and the drawings were objected to.

Regarding the objection of the drawings, an entire new set of replacement sheets are provided in the appendix hereof with the shading removed or substituted by a borderline indicating the limit of the original shading. Regarding the "enlarged exit pupil" claimed in claims 9-11 and the requirement that the enlarged exit pupil be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claim(s) please note that Figs. 1 & 2 show prior art biocular exit pupil extenders (EPE) to enlarge the diameter of the exit pupil. Figs 1 & 2 show the lightbeams directed from the output gratings (DOE2) are wider than the width of the beam incident on the input grating (DOE1). Hence the EPEs provide enlarging of the exit pupil of the imager. Thus the enlargement of an exit pupil which is the basic background of the invention is shown in the drawings.

Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is requested.

On pages 4 and 5 of the detailed action, claims 1, 3 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshida et al (U.S. 5,101,297).

Yoshida does not disclose variation in input angle of an incident light wave at a given point of a grating. The grating of Yoshida is optimized to couple light emitted from a single fixed point into a waveguide, said point being located above said waveguide. There is no variation of the input angle at a given point of the grating when the point of light emission is fixed with respect to the grating. The grating of Yoshida comprises an assembly of diffractive curves defined by the equation in column 4 to correspond to a spherical wavefront received from the fixed point of light emission. As the operation is optimized for said spherical wavefront, a

hypothetical change in the location of the point of light emission would moreover be likely to cause an increase in the divergence of the beam propagating in the waveguide and/or phase mismatch (destructive interference) and would not be consistent with the rest of Yoshida's disclosure..

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3 and 6 is requested.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. Section 103 rejection of claims 2 and 4 as being unpatentably obvious over Yoshida et al in further view of Sakai et al ( U.S. 5,279,924) claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in overcoming the novelty rejection.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 2 and 4 is requested.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of claims 5, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentably obvious over Yoshida et al in further view of Shultz et al (U.S. 6,285,813), claims 5, 7 and 8 are directly or indirectly independent from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons given above in connection with overcoming the novelty rejection.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 5, 7 and 8 is requested.


Regarding the alternative rejection of claims 9-11, under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) or alternatively under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Yoshida et al (U.S. 5,101,297) claims 9 and 11 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons given above in connection with overcoming the novelty rejection of claims 1, 3 and 6.

Withdrawal of the alternative novelty and obviousness rejection of claims 9-11 is requested.

New claims 12-15 have been added for consideration by the Examiner. No new fees are due since the total number of independent claims is equal to 3 and the total number of claims altogether is still less than 20.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of March 6, 2006, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-14 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis J. Maguire  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/lfk  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, PO Box 224  
Monroe CT 06468  
(203) 261-1234

## **APPENDIX**